## 10/725,421 ONUMA ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit Holly Rickman 1773 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Holly Rickman. (2) Scott Shulte. Date of Interview: 19 October 2004. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c)⊠ Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: claim / and all claims depending theretrom. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See below (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Mr. Shite a raved that the invention claimed veguires a soft magnetic layer and a scedlayer containing B and it is this combination that produces a benefit over what was known in the prior art. Ulr. Shite argued that the applied toes not provide sufficient motivation to The examiner indicated that the motivation to motivation is in the 2° reference.

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required